

United States of America **FILED**
13 district

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
ALBUQUERQUE, NEW MEXICO

APR 00 2021

United States
of
America (Plaintiff)

MITCHELL R. ELFERS
CLERK/mj

VS. CR-19-1991-KWR

Antonio M. CARRILLO
(Defendant)

Request FOR BAIL HEARING

IN THIS CASE I (MR. CARRILLO) BELIEVES HE IS INNOCENT OF THE CHARGES OF BOTH "INTERSTATE COMMUNICATIONS" AND "THREAT OF ARSON". THE PROSECUTION HAS ALREADY DROPPED THE CHARGE OF "INTERSTATE COMMUNICATIONS" DUE TO A LACK OF EVIDENCE. AND THE CHARGE OF "THREAT OF ARSON BEARS NO MERIT TO SUSTAIN THE CHARGE.

THE ARREST CAN ALSO BE PROVEN TO BE A "FALSE ARREST" DUE TO THE EVIDENCE THAT IS ALREADY IN THE POSSESSION OF THE COURT. THERE IS NO PAPER WORK TO SHOW (THREE ^{COMMITMENT} FORM) "PROBABLE CAUSE"; NO WARRANT WAS ISSUED PRIOR TO THE ARREST AND AT THE TIME OF MR. CARRILLO'S ARREST THE FEDERAL AGENT PROVIDED NO CHARGE. THE AGENT'S OWN WORDS WERE

"I AM arresting you because I am uncomfortable with your answers to my questions." There is No LAW That gives Authority to Federal Agents Authority to make an arrest based upon discomfort or personal feelings. There is also no law that permits a Federal Agent to make an arrest based upon Theoretical conversations. The conversation that was between the Federal Agent and MR. Carrizlo on the day of his arrest was based upon a theoretical situation of a CIVIL war. Of which there was none, It is Not Mr. Carrizlos Fault that the Agent has no understanding of Theoretical conversation.

In Addition I find No Law, No Case Law OR Any Court Procedure that gives the Federal Agent the Authority to fill out a warrant. That is the duty of the US Attorney. For an Agent to fill out the WARRANT AND buy pass the US ATTORNEY AND HAVE a Judge Sign the WARRANT is ILLEGAL. I may be a standard practice but it is still ILLEGAL according to law. This is the information Mr. Carrizlo finds in US code and Mexican Law. Furthermore The Evidence that was obtained By the Federal Agent is

FABRICATED AND IS NOT A ACCURATE DIPICITION
OF THE DEBATE THAT MR. CARRILLO HAD WITH
MANY PERSONS INVOLVED IN THE DEBATE THAT
DAY. I DO NOT REMEMBER THE EMPLOYEES OF THE
ACTU BEING INVOLVED IN THE DEBATE ONLY
LEFTIST LIBERALS WHO SUPPORT THE ACTU.

OF WHICH THERE WERE MANY. I SAY
LEFTIST LIBERALS BECAUSE I DO NOT KNOW IF THE
PERSONS ARE REGISTERED DEMOCRATS OR NOT.

IT IS THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE FEDERAL AGENT
TO COLLECT EVIDENCE AND THEN PRESENT THE EVIDENCE
TO THE US ATTORNEY FOR EVALUATION. THEN THE US ATTORNEY
FILLS OUT THE THREAT ASSESSMENT FORM, THEN IF
THE FORM HAS A HIGH ENOUGH NUMBER, THEN THE
US ATTORNEY SUBMITS A REQUEST FOR A WARRANT TO
THE JUDGE. THE THREAT ASSESSMENT FORM IS MANDATED
BY CONGRESS. AND ACCORDING TO US CODE THE
FORM MUST ACCOMPANY THE REQUEST FOR A WARRANT.

THERE IS MORE TO SAY ABOUT THE FLAWS OF
THE CASE BUT I HAVE RUN OUT OF PAPER.

I (MR. CARRILLO) REQUEST FOR A BAIL HEARING
OR THE DISMISSAL OF THE CASE DUE TO THE EVIDENCE
I (MR. CARRILLO) HAVE PROVIDED TO THE COURT.

~~Sincerely~~ Respectfully
Antonio M. Carrillo

Archdioces of Boston Vs USA - Speedy Trial
Delay during trials

Antonio Carrillo
Grady County Law Enforcement Center
#158703473

OKLAHOMA CITY OK 730
6 APR 2021 PM 5 FOREVER
U.S.



Barn Swallow

United States Court house
134th District

333 Longs Blvd N.W. S 7102

Attn: Clerks Office

This correspondence is from an inmate at
Grady County Law Enforcement Center.
GCLEC is not responsible for content.

ST 102-227299

Loyalty, Integrity, Professionalism